



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,621	01/22/2004	Andrew Hadley	03-0023	5052
24319	7590	07/06/2007		
LSI CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			EXAMINER CHU, GABRIEL L	
			ART UNIT 2114	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/762,621	Applicant(s) HADLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Gabriel L. Chu	Art Unit 2114	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claims 12, 14-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.** The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Referring to claim 12, and subsequently claims 14-21, it is not clear how “at least one function” can include “editing, storing, loading, and displaying”.

3. **Claims 12, 14-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.** The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Referring to claim 12, and subsequently claims 14-21, Applicant has shown no evidence that Applicant originally had possession of “at least one function” including “editing, storing, loading, and displaying”.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 12, 14-21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.** Referring to claim 12, and subsequently claims 14-21, it is not clear what Applicant intends by having "at least one function includes editing, storing, loading, and displaying".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 12, 17-19, 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5623499 to Ko et al. in view of "output" by Microsoft Computer Dictionary (MSCD).**

8. Referring to claim 12, Ko discloses creating a first state; creating a second state; building a state machine from the first and second states (Figure 1, Figure 3, 210, 220, Figures 4-8, Figure 10.),

the state machine being capable of executing at least one function (From line 35 of column 3, "The EFSM has a finite number of states and changes from one state to another when an input or stimulus is applied to the machine. A state is defined as a

stable condition in which the EFSM rests until the next stimulus or input is applied.

Each state transition may also cause the EFSM to update context variables or internal variables, and/or generate observable outputs which may be based on the context variables. The particular final state of an EFSM transition upon receipt of an input or stimulus may be dependent on the current EFSM state, the value of the input parameters, and the current value of context variables or internal variables.”),

the at least one function being implemented in code common to multiple parameters (From the abstract, with emphasis, “**A** method and apparatus for generating a conformance test data sequence of minimal length to verify that a device conforms to a protocol entity which can be characterized by a simplified extended finite state machine. **The** method generates an expanded directed graph of the protocol wherein each state is represented by a state vertex and a dummy vertex which are connected to other similar state and dummy vertices by directed edges in a configuration corresponding to the operation of the machine.”),

wherein the at least one function includes editing, storing, loading, and displaying (For example, from the abstract, “The generated conformance test data sequence exhaustively tests the values in the test data set, and achieves an efficiency in conformance testing by minimizing the amount of time required to perform the conformance test.” At least this citation shows that test data is loaded. Ko further discloses that an EFSM may “updat[e] context variables and the present state” (line 53 of column 1), which shows editing and storing. This is a quality of EFSMs in general and these same EFSMs are referenced throughout the specification.).

Although Ko does not explicitly disclose that one such function may include displaying, displaying is very well known in the art. An example of this is shown by MSCD, "The results of processing, whether sent to the screen or printer, stored on disk as a file, or sent to another computer in a network." A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to have output functionality because, as shown by MSCD, it shows the result of processing, but also as shown by Ko in that Ko models operation of a machine (From the abstract, with emphasis, "corresponding to the operation of the machine."), and output is a very common, well-desired functionality, and in testing functionality, it would have been obvious to test output as well.

9. Referring to claim 17, Ko discloses a look up table for storing default values of the multiple parameters (From the abstract, "The directed edges are then assigned traversal numbers corresponding to the minimum number of times a respective directed edge need be traversed in order to test values in a predetermined test data set." Table 1.).

10. Referring to claim 18, Ko discloses a look up table for providing type and value information for each of the multiple parameters (From line 6 of column 6, "After the expanded directed graph of the simplified EFSM is generated in step 220, a suitable test data set corresponding to the simplified EFSM is retrieved in step 230. A test data set is a set of input parameters which must be applied, and output parameters which must be evaluated for conformance testing of a device. The particular values of the input parameters and output parameters in the test data set may be specified by

Art Unit: 2114

designers or conformance testers of the protocol entity. The test data set facilitates the exercise of a state transition several times with different values of the same input and output parameter that may be required to verify that the operation of a device exactly conforms to the protocol entity. For example, consider a transition **##EQU1##** which takes an input parameter "phno", changes from a state S.sub.1 to a state S.sub.2, and produces an output parameter "status". Values of the output parameter status are 'invalid', 'local', 'domestic' or 'international' depending on the value of the input parameter "phno". The test data set for such a transition may be given in the form of the following input-output table 1." From line 57 of column 11, "A parameter is considered independent from another parameter if it may take on any value in its permitted range without affecting the constraints on the value of the other input parameter.").

11. Referring to claim 19, Ko discloses the type and value information includes a range of values that are permitted for each of the multiple parameters (From line 57 of column 11, "A parameter is considered independent from another parameter if it may take on any value in its permitted range without affecting the constraints on the value of the other input parameter.").

12. Referring to claim 21, Ko discloses at least one of the multiple parameters is independent of type (From line 53 of column 11, "If the parameters a and b are independent, then the traversal number assigned to the directed edge is the maximum number of values that either a or b must be tested according to the test data set listed above. A parameter is considered independent from another parameter if it may take on

any value in its permitted range without affecting the constraints on the value of the other input parameter. According to the test data set the parameter a must be tested with the values 0, 5 and 9 and the parameter b must be tested with the values 1 and 4. There is no indication in the test data set or in the simplified EFSM 5 of FIG. 1 that the parameters a and b are dependent on one another. Thus, the traversal number T.sub.1,111 is assigned a value 3, as indicated by a label 317 in FIG. 4, because it is the maximum number either parameter a or b must be evaluated with during conformance testing. However, if the parameters a and b were not independent then the corresponding traversal number needs to be changed accordingly. In such an instance, the traversal number T.sub.1,11 must be assigned a value equal to the greater of the sum of the dependent parameter combinations or the maximum number any one of the parameters needs to be tested according to the test data sequence. For instance, if the parameters a and b were not independent upon each other then the directed edge 315 may have to be traversed with particular combinations of the parameters a and b.”).

**13. Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5623499 to Ko et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of US 20030093608 to Jaramillo et al.** Referring to claim 14, although Ko does not specifically disclose the multiple parameters include a PCI cache line size, adjusting a PCI cache line size is known in the art. An example of this is shown by Jaramillo from paragraph 44, “This approach can be implemented by using other multiples or with a programmable multiple, or the standard PCI specification cache line size register can be adjusted such that the PCI to PCI bridge 350 actually prefetches multiple cache lines.” A



person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to use PCI cache line size as a parameter because, from paragraph 44 of Jaramillo, "It raises the overall system performance dramatically." Further, such a parameter would have been included for testing because Ko discloses from line 60 of column 15, "Further, although the example EFSM concerned a communications protocol, the present invention may be used for generating conformance test data sequences for any entity that can be characterized by a simplified EFSM." and Ko further discloses from line 10 of column 6, "The particular values of the input parameters and output parameters in the test data set may be specified by designers or conformance testers of the protocol entity. The test data set facilitates the exercise of a state transition several times with different values of the same input and output parameter that may be required to verify that the operation of a device exactly conforms to the protocol entity."

**14. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5623499 to Ko et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of US 6675244 to Elliot et al.** Referring to claim 15, although Ko does not specifically disclose the multiple parameters include a Small Computer System Interface (SCSI) synchronous rate, adjusting the SCSI system rate is known in the art. An example of this is shown by Elliot from line 34 of column 7, "The ASRT state 608 is a transitory state in which the timer is loaded with a value suitable for a delay discussed in conjunction with the next state, a WAIT\_ASRT state 610. The value loaded into the timer during the ASRT state 608 depends on whether the linear mode is enabled, what the determined SCSI synchronous rate is, and whether this particular clock pulse is

being "stretched". These aspects are further discussed below in conjunction with FIGS. 8-12. To summarize, if the linear mode is enabled, the SCSI clock will be asserted for a number of repeater 40 clock cycles that most closely matches the incoming clock signal from the other side of the repeater 40, but with some degree of "snapping" when the rate is near a standard SCSI rate." A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to include a SCSI synchronous rate because, as disclosed by Elliot, the rate affects system performance. Further, such a parameter would have been included for testing because Ko discloses from line 60 of column 15, "Further, although the example EFSM concerned a communications protocol, the present invention may be used for generating conformance test data sequences for any entity that can be characterized by a simplified EFSM." and Ko further discloses from line 10 of column 6, "The particular values of the input parameters and output parameters in the test data set may be specified by designers or conformance testers of the protocol entity. The test data set facilitates the exercise of a state transition several times with different values of the same input and output parameter that may be required to verify that the operation of a device exactly conforms to the protocol entity."

15. **Claim 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5623499 to Ko et al. as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of "block size" by Microsoft Computer Dictionary (MSCD).** Referring to claim 16, although Ko does not specifically disclose the multiple parameters include block size, adjusting the block size is known in the art. An example of this is shown by MSCD, "The declared size of a block of data transferred internally within a computer, via FTP, or by modem.

Art Unit: 2114

The size is usually chosen to make most efficient use of all the hardware devices involved." A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to include a block size because, as disclosed by MSCD, the block size affects system performance. Further, such a parameter would have been included for testing because Ko discloses from line 60 of column 15, "Further, although the example EFSM concerned a communications protocol, the present invention may be used for generating conformance test data sequences for any entity that can be characterized by a simplified EFSM." and Ko further discloses from line 10 of column 6, "The particular values of the input parameters and output parameters in the test data set may be specified by designers or conformance testers of the protocol entity. The test data set facilitates the exercise of a state transition several times with different values of the same input and output parameter that may be required to verify that the operation of a device exactly conforms to the protocol entity."

**16. Claim 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5623499 to Ko et al. as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of US 6546507 to Coyle et al.** Referring to claim 20, Ko discloses that parameters in the test data set have a range that is stepped through (From line 57 of column 11, "A parameter is considered independent from another parameter if it may take on any value in its permitted range without affecting the constraints on the value of the other input parameter."). Although Ko does not specifically disclose the type and value information includes an incremental step size for each of the multiple parameters, using an incremental step for testing values is known in the art. An example of this is shown by

Art Unit: 2114

Coyle, from line 46 of column 39, "The method 2850 starts at block 2852, where it verifies that the system operates correctly at a given initial value. The method 2850 in block 2854 tests whether the system passes at that value. If it does not, block 2856 reports a system failure. If the system passes, block 2858 adjusts the initial value to a new value, e.g., a single step up in the value. Block 2862 tests the system at this new value, and, if it passes, block 2862 saves the new value to a variable called HIGHGOOD. Then, method 2850 returns to block 2858 where the value can be again incremented in the same direction. If the test of block 2860 fails, the method 2850 proceeds to block 2864, where it resets the parameter to the initial value. Then, block 2866 tests whether the system passes at this value. If it does not, then block 2868 reports a system failure. If the system passes, block 2872 adjusts the parameter in the opposite direction to that of block 2858, e.g., a single step down. In other words, one of the blocks 2858 and 2872 increments the parameter value to test the operational limit in one direction, while the other decrements that value to test the operational limit in the other direction." A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incrementally step because as disclosed by Coyle, it permits operational envelope testing, and further as disclosed by Ko, there is a range of values that need to be tested for a given parameter.

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim as, 14-121 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gabriel L. Chu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3656. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays between 8:30 AM and 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Baderman can be reached on (571) 272-3644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2114

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Gabriel L. Chu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2114

gc